

Applicant: Kari M. Mäki
Application No.: 09/966,424
Art Unit: 3629

Remarks

Claims 2-11, 19, and 20 remain pending in the application. In the Office Action dated April 15, 2004, claims 2-11, 19 and 20 were rejected as obvious over EP 0822 473 in view of MOTOYAMA (US patent 5,909,493) or further in view of EP 0825 506.

Applicant respectively requests the examiner to withdraw the finality of the present office action because the office action failed to provide any reason why the final limitation of claim 19 "wherein data, video and/or audio signals are transferred between the production plant and the service unit" is obvious in view of the prior art. Claim 19 has been amended to clarify, if necessary, that at least one of video or audio data is transmitted over the Internet and through the firewalls.

Claim 20 has been amended to specifically set out specific components of the information system and the process steps they perform. The amended claim sets forth limitations which distinguish over the art of record, there being no suggestion for combining of the admitted prior art of FIG. 1 with a service system server which communicates bidirectionally through two firewalls and performs the claimed functions. The claim 20 as amended is specific to a paper mill, a board mill, a pulp production plant, or a paper finishing plant. The prior art of record does not teach or make obvious the invention as now claimed, because the prior art does not show or suggest a paper mill, a board mill, a pulp production plant, or a paper finishing plant including

- a process control system
- a production management system
- a maintenance information system
- a machinery condition monitoring system
- a reporting system

wherein information collected from such systems is sent through two firewalls to an information network of a remote service unit. Motoyama, which shows remote communication through two firewalls, is for machines such as copiers, printers, and facsimile devices, and does not set forth the specific process limitations of claim 20 nor suggest the

Applicant: Kari M. Mäki
Application No.: 09/966,424
Art Unit: 3629


process limitations as claimed.

A rejection is not properly based on picking and choose from the prior art to create applicant's invention, rather, contained within the prior art, there must be some suggestion, or motivation, for doing what applicant has done. The use of hindsight to pick and choose attributes of the prior art, to create the invention. does not render a claim obvious.

Applicant believes that no new matter has been added by this amendment.

Applicant submits that the claims, as amended, are in condition for allowance.
Favorable action thereon is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Patrick J. G. Stiennon, Reg. No. 34934
Attorney for Applicant
Stiennon & Stiennon
P.O. Box 1667
Madison, Wisconsin 53701-1667
(608) 250-4870
Amdt2.rcs/amdt